

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-7 were rejected in this application.

Claims 1, 3-4, and 6-7 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 1-7 remain in this application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO ABSTRACT

The Office Action objected to the specification for various informalities in the Abstract. The Applicants have amended the Abstract so that the Abstract is one paragraph. The Applicants have also removed the extra lines at the end of the Abstract. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

II. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objected to Claims 1 and 3-7 for various informalities. The Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 3-7 to correct the informalities noted in the Office Action. Regarding Claims 4-6, the Applicants have amended Claims 4 and 6 so that these claims do not depend from Claim 1. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as their invention. The Applicants have amended Claim 3 to correct the informality noted in the Office Action. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,103,191 by Werker ("*Werker*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A cited prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single cited prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Werker recites a circuit configuration for phase locking that includes a controllable oscillator. (*Abstract*). *Werker* uses a phase detector, a charge pump, and a loop filter to control the oscillator. (*Col. 2, Lines 26-34*). *Werker* recites that the charge pump may charge or discharge the loop filter, and the phase detector controls the charge pump in a "pulsed fashion." (*Col. 1, Lines 28-38*).

Werker simply mentions that a charge pump can be controlled in a pulsed fashion. *Werker* lacks any mention of using a regulation signal having a “succession of pulses,” where each pulse has a “width which is modulated according to the frequency difference which exists between said first and second input signals” as recited in Claims 1 and 7. As a result, *Werker* fails to anticipate the Applicants’ invention recited in Claims 1 and 7 (and Claims 2-3 depending from Claim 1).

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7.

SUMMARY

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims and that this application be passed to issue. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: March 19, 2003

William A. Munck
William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *wmunck@davismunck.com*